

~~SECRET~~

29 April 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: DoD GRILL FLAME Committee Meeting, 28-29 April 1981 (U)

1. (U) This MFR outlines the major topics discussed or covered during the 2-day DoD GRILL FLAME committee meeting hosted by INSCOM on 28-29 April 1981.

2. (C) The following personnel attended the meetings as indicated:

SG1J [REDACTED] DIA: 28-29 Apr 81
[REDACTED] DIA: 28-29 Apr 81
Dr. Hal Puthoff, SRI-I: 28 Apr 81
SG1I Dr. Ed May, SRI-I: 28 Apr 81
[REDACTED] 28-29 Apr 81
LTC Murray Watt, INSCOM: 28-29 Apr 81

3. (C) Purpose(s) of the meeting:

a. Review progress of current contract work, to include any problem areas.

b. To discuss future goals and contractual efforts that might be necessary to support the overall program.

4. (C) I discussed the ACSI message of 11 Feb 81 which transferred overall management of the Army Grill Flame effort from OACSI to HQ, USAINSCOM. I pointed out that ACSI still retained control over policy matters but that most matters pertaining to Army involved in project Grill Flame should come through this office and, as appropriate, we would forward actions to ACSI as needed.

5. (C) MAJ O'Keefe explained the reason behind the delay in the transfer of Army monies (120K) in support of project Grill Flame to DIA. Basically, the Army General Council (GC) has requested that the DoD General Council re-examine their position regarding the "Human Use Issue." DoD GC has stated that the program does not involve human use while the Army GC feels that it is. The ACSI has been advised by the Army GC not to transfer any funds until the issue is resolved. ACSI has agreed and so we wait. [REDACTED] strongly objected to the Army delay and felt we (Army) were being very unreasonable in not following the "latest orders" (i.e., initial DoD GC decision) that we had received. This point has caused considerable hard feelings and some embarrassment and needs to be resolved rapidly.

6. (C) [REDACTED] announced that he needed to have statement of work prepared by 1 Jun 81 in order to let contract for FY 82 beginning in Oct 82. I told him that there was no way that INSCOM would be prepared to give him solid input by 1 Jun 81. I pointed out that INSCOM was undergoing change of command and that new commander would not be taking over until 7 May 81. I stated we would try and get on his calendar soonest, but they had to appreciate the many problems facing a commander of a MACOM.

~~SECRET~~CLASSIFIED BY: MSG, DAMI-ISH
051630Z Jul 78

SG1J

7. (U) [REDACTED] then ran through the briefing slides he had prepared for Thursday (30 Apr) briefing to MG Thompson and Dr. Vorona, DIA. Many questions were left unanswered and when we (O'Keefe/Watt) asked for further data we were informed that a complete packet would be provided at the briefing answering all our questions. I asked that [REDACTED] bring copies to our Wednesday meeting so that the Army action officers could review the material prior to the meeting. He assured me he would do so. (NOTE: He didn't.)

SG1J

SG1J

8. (S) On Wednesday, 29 Apr 81, [REDACTED] presented the following as his recommended program for DIA/Army consideration for FY 82:

- a. (S) DIA Program (Recommended)
 - 100K-intelligence assessment (review Soviet/Chinese efforts, duplicate Soviet efforts)
 - 60K-Operational RV tasks
 - 60K-RV countermeasures
 - 60K-Assessment & utilization of psychotronics.

SG1J

- b. (S) Army program (as recommended by [REDACTED])
 - 195K-RV reliability enhancement (training)
 - 100K-Data Base Management
 - 100K-Targeting-follow on of FY 81 program

SG1J

[REDACTED] stated that SRI could train four people of any given time. That Ingo Swann left SRI in Dec 80 and has only been back once. He left because SRI had no money left to continue developing his training program. This is one of the many "confusing" conditions existing between SRI and DIA. In Dec 80, [REDACTED] asked me if we could get money to continue the training program. After I briefed OACSI on this request MG Thompson directed MAJ Hay and myself to study the situation and give him a recommendation. MAJ Hay called [REDACTED] in mid-December and was told that [REDACTED] could handle Swann and the training program needed no additional funds. Yet, we now find out that Swann left SRI in late Dec because the "pot ran dry."

SG1J

SG1J

SG1J

SG1J

9. (S) I then responded to [REDACTED] recommended Army program and offered some additional plans.

a. First, our total budget for FY 82 is only 159K. Hence, the proposed plan is way beyond our currently planned effort. A rough planning figure would be that approx 140K would be available for contracts.....

b. And, I stressed not necessarily with SRI and that I was not making any commitments of any kind at this time.

c. We did agree that training was the number one priority. However, we wanted a clarification of the status of the current training program or were we being asked to fund the continued growth of the training program which does not appear to be on track.

d. The targeting follow-on packet I recommended be tabled and perhaps considered for FY 83. At least, let's see what they do with the FY 81 targeting package which they (SRI) haven't even begun.

e. Data Base Management (DBM): We do not concur with this aspect of the program. INSCOM ASA element has looked at their proposal and has recommended against it. I did suggest that perhaps DIA/Army could help SRI put together hardware package for handling their own in-house data base.

f. Recommended that some funds might be used in support of developing tracking procedures. 65K.

g. Recommended that DIA/Army team make necessary field trips to visit organizations involved in research.

h. (C) Recommended that physiological monitoring program be started if appropriate contractor can be uncovered.

10. (S) DIA reps clearly feel that SRI is the only organization fully accredited, properly organized, and ready to respond to DoD taskings and, therefore, it is not necessary to expand scope of work beyond SRI. If we find something of interest and needed for the program.....fine, tell DIA and they will have SRI build a program for us (that is the prevailing attitude of [REDACTED] as I "read him").

SG1J

MURRAY B. WATT
LTC, MI
Project Manager